



# County of Fairfax, Virginia

To protect and enrich the quality of life for the people, neighborhoods and diverse communities of Fairfax County

## Reston Network Analysis & Funding Advisory Group MEETING #4 MINUTES

**DATE:** December 14, 2015  
**TIME:** 7:00pm-9:00pm  
**LOCATION:** North County Government Center  
**ATTENDEES:**

### Advisory Group

Andy Sigle (Advisory Group Chair)  
Robert Goudie (Reston Town Center Association)  
Liana Kang (Polo Fields Resident)  
Mark Looney (Greater Reston Chamber of Commerce)  
Maggie Parker (Comstock)  
Absent: John Mossgrove, Delores Bailey, Tim Cohn,  
Matt Valentini, Cate Fulkerson, Bill Keefe

### Staff

Kristin Calkins (FCDOT, Network Analysis Project Manager)  
Janet Nguyen (FCDOT, Funding Plan Project Manager)  
Tom Biesiadny (FCDOT, Director)  
Ray Johnson (FCDOT)  
Paul Davis (Hunter Mill District Office)

### I. Meeting Summary

This was the fourth meeting of the Reston Network Analysis and Funding Advisory Group. FCDOT staff presented an overview potential sources of revenue for the Reston Funding Plan and possible combinations of funds.

### General Discussion

- Chairman Andy Sigle called the meeting to order at 7:09 pm.
- Draft meeting minutes for Meeting 2 (September 14, 2015) and Meeting 3 (November 9, 2015) were presented to the group for consideration
- Maggie Parker moved that the meeting minutes be adopted, it was seconded by Liana Kang. The meeting minutes were approved unanimously, with Mark Looney abstaining from the November 9<sup>th</sup> vote. The meeting minutes can be found at:
  - <http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/fcdot/restonnetworkanalysis/advisoryminutes.htm>
- Kristin Calkins (FCDOT) gave a summary of related Reston meetings held since the Advisory Group last met:
  - Reston Network Analysis Stakeholder Meeting: a meeting to go over existing conditions and the modeling process with the Stakeholders Group was held November 20 at the FCDOT offices.
  - Board Authorization of HMSAMS & RMAG2 Funding: Kristin handed out a list of the approved projects, totaling \$23 million in improvements. There was discussion about if the bike and pedestrian projects would affect the assumptions in the Network Analysis. Kristin explained that many of the improvements are happening outside the roadway, or are reallocating. Tom added that the HMSAMS/RMAG improvements are short-term improvements. The Reston Network Analysis will take a 30-40 year look, and builds on some of the HMSAMS/RMAG improvements. If Advisory Group Members would like further

information about the improvements in the Board Authorization, they can reach out to Kristin. Andy asked if there can be a link provided on the Network Analysis web page to the RMAG site.

- Ray followed-up to a Bikeshare question from the previous meeting: staff will be bringing a motion in January to approve \$1.1 million for Bikeshare, roughly \$400,000 is from a Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) grant and the rest will be paid by funds from Commercial & Industrial (C&I) taxes. Bikeshare is slated to launch in Reston in Fall of 2016.
- Kristin gave a brief overview of the Network Analysis, including that the consultants are working on a first run of the 2050 model. The information will not include any mitigation measures. This information is planned to be presented Monday, January 11, 2016 and Friday, January 15, 2016 to the Advisory Group and Stakeholders respectively.

### **Reston Funding Plan Development**

Tom provided a brief introduction to the presentation, including that it was an extension of the discussion at the previous Advisory Group Meeting. The presentation will go over different funding components, including types, implications, possible generation, and a review of the Tysons Funding Plan. Tom emphasized that staff is interested in any feedback the Advisory Group has on the different sources.

Janet presented potential sources of revenue for funding Reston Transportation Improvements.

- Janet indicated that the funding plan will pay for improvements that were recommended as part of the Reston Phase I Plan Amendment.
- Staff has completed preliminary cost estimates for the improvements (in 2015 dollars) to help inform the total need for the Funding Plan.
- To complete the Funding Plan project prioritization and the public/private split of funding responsibility will need to be determined, in addition to the determination of funding sources.
- There are three improvement types included in the Funding Plan:
  - Large infrastructure projects
  - Intersection improvements
  - The Grid of Streets
- The total need for the Reston Funding Plan is \$2.69 billion.
- Janet provided an overview of the various funding mechanisms and sources available in the County. This overview included both public and private funds.
- Possible public funds available included Federal, State and Local Sources.
  - Janet did mention that using Federal funds can increase overall project costs, and add to the timeframe of a project.
- Mark had a question about the projects where Federal funds would be applied. Tom indicated that Federal funds would most likely be applied to the Dulles Toll Road Crossings.
- Liana asked what NVTa is. Tom clarified that NVTa is the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority. It is made up of the jurisdictions in Northern Virginia and is responsible for the allocation of transportation funds in Northern Virginia. The NVTa Board is made up of elected officials from the local jurisdictions.
- Mark asked how much funding would be likely to come to Reston via the NVTa. Tom indicated that the \$40 million would not come each year, but would be allocated to viable projects over time. It would be one of many sources of revenue necessary to create a Funding Plan.

- There was a question about the impacts of HB2 on the allocation of funds in Reston. Tom indicated that the bill requires projects to be graded for congestion mitigation, and that the County is encouraging the State to keep their amount of funds available to match local jurisdictions at their current rate. This allows the State to stretch their money further, as local jurisdictions apply their own funds to projects, more information on HB2 can be found at, <http://www.virginiahb2.org/faqs/default.asp>
  - The Funding Plan will use the monies available from HB2 & HB1887 cautiously as they are new processes.
- There was a question if the County receives their fair share back for the 30% funds NVTa allocates.
  - Tom clarified that the County receives funds based on the percentage of funds Fairfax raises from sales tax.
- Maggie asked if there were any jurisdictions who are currently using Vehicle Miles Tax (VMT) as a source of revenue.
  - Tom indicated that Oregon is investigating it as a revenue source.
- Janet concluded the section on potential funding sources by indicating that the County currently receives \$303,000,000 in transportation funds (a combination of Federal, Local and State revenues described in the presentation)
  - However, these funds are not available for Reston until after 2021, as all funds have been allocated through the end of that year.
- Mark asked what the funds per square foot in Tysons are.
  - Staff responded that they are currently
  - \$6.71 per sq. ft. of non-residential building structure for the Tysons Grid Fund
  - \$5.87 per sq. ft. of non-residential building structure for the Tysons-wide Fund
- A community attendee asked if the costs per square foot were in addition to the grid built by the developer.
  - Tom responded that every rezoning is a negotiation, and that costs would be worked out between staff and developers.
- Janet gave an overview of the Tysons Model for transportation Funding.
- Robert had a question about what was considered inside Tysons vs. outside Tysons for the plan.
  - Staff indicated that inside Tysons is the Tysons boundary, while outside are beyond the boundary in the Comprehensive Plan. Many of these projects are needed to support people getting to Tysons, but are not within the Tysons boundary.
  - Tom indicated that the Reston Plan could be done in a similar fashion, the equivalent for 'Inside Reston' would be the three Transit Station Areas.
- Tom indicated that it took over 10 sources to develop a Funding plan for Tysons, which means that there will be a similar need for finding various sources in Reston.
  - Robert asked if the Tysons Service district (one of the sources of funding) has an end year. Tom indicated that it is reauthorized/set by the Board annually.
- A member of the community asked where the \$1.284 billion for the grid came from, and if the grid funds will be set up similar to Tysons
  - Tom indicated that the grid of streets is still being defined, and that it is too early to determine how the cost of building it will be split.

### Group Discussion

Andy invited all meeting attendees to sit at the table and have an open discussion on the presentation. Three attendees joined the Advisory Group and Staff in the discussion.

- There was continued discussion of what is inside and outside the TSA.
  - Kristin clarified that the TSAs are depicted in the Network Analysis Study Area, and comprise the Phase I Study Area.
- Liana discussed that she is worried that Reston is being treated too similarly to Tysons. Reston is not Tysons in that it already has a large number of residents.
  - Tom assured that staff is not duplicating the Tysons Plan, it is only the most recent example of a similar effort.
- Mark asked how much public sector funding is anticipated after 2021.
  - Tom replied that the process (of creating the funding plan) will determine the need for public funding.
- The group asked what is happening in regards to funding for the existing rezoning applications.
  - Tom indicated that staff hopes to have a funding plan completed by spring, but that in the meantime, cases that go early can proffer to participate in the funding plan. Similar to the process in Tysons
- Andy asked if there are ranges for the availability of funding sources. Is it possible for developers to help inform what numbers are viable in Reston based on a cost per square foot?
  - Tom indicated that this will be a part of the continued discussion and subsequent meetings.
- A group member indicated that the crossings of the Toll Road are expensive, but the density in Reston is not comparable to the density in Tysons. He was worried that this means the rate in Reston will be too high.
  - Tom mentioned that the numbers will have to be reasonable to ensure that development continues in Reston.
- Andy indicated that there are already a number of different taxes/fees on Reston residents; including residential cluster association fees, Reston Association fees, County Property Tax, Small Tax District 5, etc. He is interested in how the County would have Reston residents think of the split of funds for these transportation improvements between current taxes and new sources, and from whom any new sources will be levied (e.g. from developers and residents inside the TSAs or from further afield)?
- Mark asked how the funding plan in Tysons has worked thus far.
  - Tom indicated that the Grid and Tysons wide funds are off to a strong start. The Board allocated their funds to begin design work on projects.
    - It is tracking where staff had anticipated.
- Mark asked if the County Board is willing to do condemnation.
  - Tom indicated that condemnation is always a last step for the County. The County negotiates with property owners and 99% of the time comes to an agreement without turning to condemnation.
- Robert suggested that many of the funding opportunities are not realistic for the Reston Network Funding Plan. The meals, hotel, and gas tax shouldn't be considered viable sources of funding for the Plan. Anything that requires General Assembly approval is not a reasonable source of funds for this plan.
- Mark indicated that staff should indicate which links will be built as part of development, and which links will have to be built to fill in the gaps.
  - There was a comment made that filling in the missing links in Reston might be hard to do.
- Mark asked what is considered a Transit Station Area improvement vs. a County improvement.

- He indicated that Soapstone could be considered a County improvement as it pulls local traffic off of Reston Parkway and Wiehle Avenue.
- Robert mentioned that the Soapstone and Town Center crossings are traditional public infrastructure projects.
- Tom reiterated that it's going to take a combination of sources to build the improvements in the Comprehensive Plan.
- Discussion centered on what the private and public contributions to some of these projects should be.
  - Liana indicated that the projects should be looked at as layers of a network, instead of geographic based on their geographical location.
  - Tom indicated that we can be flexible with how the plan is put together, as it is authorized and approved locally.
- Andy would like to see a variety of ways that the projects could be categorized; e.g. infrastructure, grid, congestion relief, TSA local, other categories to better understand the different ways that the funds could be allocated across those categories?
- Mark asked if it could be assumed that the grid of streets is built by developers, so the plan only has to focus on the larger projects.
- A comment was made that the County needs to ensure that metro accessible locations do not get shortchanged when it comes to transportation funding.
  - Tom indicated that county wide transportation funding is a balancing act. There are countywide needs and county wide contributions.
- Robert asked if the feedback thus far has been helpful.
  - Staff indicated that it has been, and if there are any additional comments to reach out to Janet.
- Andy asked the group to give any final recommendations or requests prior to the conclusion of the discussion:
  - Robert would like to see which of the improvements FCDOT considers traditional public works projects vs. what could be considered the grid of streets.
  - Mark would like to see:
    - What the dollar amount per developable square foot approved in the Comprehensive Plan would be based on the \$1.284 billion.
    - If a service district was a reasonable source.
  - A community member asked if there are ways of ensuring that the funds raised through service districts stay in the district.
    - Staff indicated that they do.

## **II. Action Items**

- *FCDOT Staff:*
  - Meeting Minutes
  - Confirm the Advisory Group Meeting on Monday, January 11, 2015 the first week in January.

## **III. Next Steps**

- Next Advisory Group meeting will be held on Monday, January 11, 2015
- Next Stakeholder meeting will be Friday, December 15, 2015